arXiv:hep-ph/0508231v2 23 Aug 2005

UCRHEP-T397
August 2005

Neutrino Mass Matrix from S_4 Symmetry

Ernest Ma

Physics Department, University of California, Riverside, California 92521, USA,
and Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, Department of Physics,
University of Durham, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK

Abstract

The cubic symmetry S_4 contains A_4 and S_3, both of which have been used to study neutrino mass matrices. Using S_4 as the family symmetry of a complete supersymmetric theory of leptons, it is shown how the requirement of breaking S_4 at the seesaw scale without breaking supersymmetry enforces a special form of the neutrino mass matrix which exhibits maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing as well as zero U_{e3}. In addition, $(\nu_e + \nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{3}$ is naturally close to being a mass eigenstate, thus predicting $\tan^2 \theta_{12}$ to be near but not equal to 1/2.

In atmospheric neutrino oscllation data [1], the persistence of maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing has raised the important theoretical question of whether it is due to an underlying symmetry. The naive response is that it is due to the exchange of ν_μ with ν_τ, but since ν_μ and ν_τ are respective members of the $SU(2)_L$ doublets (ν_μ, μ) and (ν_τ, τ), this symmetry automatically implies the exchange of μ with τ. As such, it cannot be sustained in the full Lagrangian, because the assumed diagonality of the charged-lepton mass matrix (witn $m_\mu \neq m_\tau$) is then lost.

A related issue is whether or not $U_{e3} = 0$. If $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ exchange were a legitimate symmetry, then this would also be "predicted". On the other hand, $U_{e3} = 0$ by itself can be supported by a different symmetry of the full Lagrangian [2], although the latter is generally unable to shed any light on how maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing could be achieved.

With the implementation of non-Abelian discrete symmetries such as S_3 [3], D_4 [4], and A_4 [5], as well as Q_4 [6] and Q_6 [7], it is indeed possible to have both maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing and zero U_{e3}, as well as a prediction of the mixing angle in solar neutrino oscillations [8] in some cases. However, specific *ad hoc* assumptions regarding the symmetry breaking sector must be made, usually with the addition of arbitrary auxiliary Abelian discrete symmetries [9].

In this paper, the problem is solved by invoking a very simple requirement. The complete theory of leptons is assumed to be supersymmetric with S_4 as its family symmetry. Neutrino masses are assumed to come from the canonical seesaw mechanism [10] with heavy singlet neutral fermions N. The key is to allow S_4 to be broken by the Majorana mass matrix of N at the seesaw scale, but not the supersymmetry. This requirement then fixes the pattern of symmetry breaking and thus the form of $\mathcal{M}_N$, and subsequently also $\mathcal{M}_\nu$, as shown below.

The group of the permutation of four objects is S_4 [11]. It is also the symmetry group of the hexahedron, i.e. the cube, one of five (and only five) perfect geometric solids, which

was identified by Plato with the element "earth" [12]. It has 24 elements divided into 5 equivalence classes, with $\underline{1}$, $\underline{1}'$, $\underline{2}$, $\underline{3}$, and $\underline{3}'$ as its 5 irreducible representations. Its character table is given below.

Table 1: Character table of S_4.

Class	n	h	χ_1	$\chi_{1'}$	χ_2	χ_3	$\chi_{3'}$
C_1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3
C_2	3	2	1	1	2	–1	–1
C_3	8	3	1	1	–1	0	0
C_4	6	4	1	–1	0	–1	1
C_5	6	2	1	–1	0	1	–1

The two three-dimensional representations differ only in the signs of their C_4 and C_5 matrices. Their group multiplication rules are similar to those of A_4 [13], namely

$$\underline{3} \times \underline{3} = \underline{1} + \underline{2} + \underline{3}_S + \underline{3}'_A, \quad (1)$$

$$\underline{3}' \times \underline{3}' = \underline{1} + \underline{2} + \underline{3}_S + \underline{3}'_A, \quad (2)$$

$$\underline{3} \times \underline{3}' = \underline{1}' + \underline{2} + \underline{3}'_S + \underline{3}_A, \quad (3)$$

where the subscripts S and A refer to their symmetric and antisymmetric product combinations respectively. The two-dimensional representation behaves exactly as its S_3 counterpart, namely

$$\underline{2} \times \underline{2} = \underline{1} + \underline{1}' + \underline{2}. \quad (4)$$

The three N's are assigned to the $\underline{3}$ representation. To obtain a nontrivial $\mathcal{M}_N$, the singlet Higgs superfields $\sigma_{1,2,3} \sim \underline{3}$ and $\zeta_{1,2} \sim \underline{2}$ are assumed. Consequently in the $N_{1,2,3}$ basis,

$$\mathcal{M}_N = \begin{pmatrix} A + f(\langle\zeta_2\rangle + \langle\zeta_1\rangle) & h\langle\sigma_3\rangle & h\langle\sigma_2\rangle \\ h\langle\sigma_3\rangle & A + f(\omega\langle\zeta_2\rangle + \omega^2\langle\zeta_1\rangle) & h\langle\sigma_1\rangle \\ h\langle\sigma_2\rangle & h\langle\sigma_1\rangle & A + f(\omega^2\langle\zeta_2\rangle + \omega\langle\zeta_1\rangle) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/3)$. The most general S_4-invariant superpotential of σ and ζ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \frac{1}{2}M(\sigma_1\sigma_1 + \sigma_2\sigma_2 + \sigma_3\sigma_3) + \lambda\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3 + m\zeta_1\zeta_2 + \frac{1}{3}\rho(\zeta_1\zeta_1\zeta_1 + \zeta_2\zeta_2\zeta_2) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\sigma_1\sigma_1 + \omega\sigma_2\sigma_2 + \omega^2\sigma_3\sigma_3)\zeta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\sigma_1\sigma_1 + \omega^2\sigma_2\sigma_2 + \omega\sigma_3\sigma_3)\zeta_1. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The resulting scalar potential is then

$$\begin{aligned} V &= |M\sigma_1 + \lambda\sigma_2\sigma_3 + \kappa\sigma_1(\zeta_2 + \zeta_1)|^2 \\ &+ |M\sigma_2 + \lambda\sigma_3\sigma_1 + \kappa\sigma_2(\omega\zeta_2 + \omega^2\zeta_1)|^2 \\ &+ |M\sigma_3 + \lambda\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \kappa\sigma_3(\omega^2\zeta_2 + \omega\zeta_1)|^2 \\ &+ |m\zeta_1 + \rho\zeta_2\zeta_2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\sigma_1\sigma_1 + \omega\sigma_2\sigma_2 + \omega^2\sigma_3\sigma_3)|^2 \\ &+ |m\zeta_2 + \rho\zeta_1\zeta_1 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\sigma_1\sigma_1 + \omega^2\sigma_2\sigma_2 + \omega\sigma_3\sigma_3)|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

For supersymmetry to be unbroken, $V_{min} = 0$ is required. This is possible only if $\langle\zeta_1\rangle = \langle\zeta_2\rangle$ and $\langle\sigma_2\rangle = \langle\sigma_3\rangle$, for which

$$M\langle\sigma_1\rangle + \lambda\langle\sigma_2\rangle^2 + 2\kappa\langle\sigma_1\rangle\langle\zeta_1\rangle = 0, \tag{8}$$

$$M + \lambda\langle\sigma_1\rangle - \kappa\langle\zeta_1\rangle = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$m\langle\zeta_1\rangle + \rho\langle\zeta_1\rangle^2 + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\langle\sigma_1\rangle^2 - \langle\sigma_2\rangle^2) = 0, \tag{10}$$

where $\omega + \omega^2 = -1$ has been used. Thus $\mathcal{M}_N$ is fixed to be of the form

$$\mathcal{M}_N = \begin{pmatrix} A+2B & C & C \\ C & A-B & D \\ C & D & A-B \end{pmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

where $B = f\langle\zeta_1\rangle$, $C = h\langle\sigma_2\rangle$, and $D = h\langle\sigma_1\rangle$.

The residual symmetry of the theory is then Z_2, under which $(N_2 - N_3)$, $(\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)$, $(\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)$ are odd, and N_1, $(N_2 + N_3)$, σ_1, $(\sigma_2 + \sigma_3)$, $(\zeta_1 + \zeta_2)$ are even. If $\langle\zeta_{1,2}\rangle = 0$, then $B = 0$, $C = D$, and the residual symmetry is S_3, under which $(N_1 + N_2 + N_3)$, $(\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3) \sim \underline{1}$;

$(N_1 + \omega N_2 + \omega^2 N_3, N_1 + \omega^2 N_2 + \omega N_3), (\sigma_1 + \omega\sigma_2 + \omega^2\sigma_3, \sigma_1 + \omega^2\sigma_2 + \omega\sigma_3), (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \sim \underline{2}$. The Z_2 (and the approximate S_3) symmetry of $\mathcal{M}_N$ is preserved in $\mathcal{M}_N^{-1}$.

Consider now the leptons (ν_i, l_i) and l_j^c of the Standard Model. They are also assigned to the $\underline{3}$ representation of S_4. As for the Higgs doublet superfields, they are assumed to be $\underline{1} + \underline{2}$, with one set coupling (ν_i, l_i) to l_j^c and the other coupling (ν_i, l_i) to N_j, as in any supersymmetric extension of the Standard Model. Nonzero vacuum expectation values of the scalar components of these Higgs superfields break the electroweak symmetry, but because of their S_4 structure, the $l_i l_j^c$ mass matrix is diagonal, as well as that of $\nu_i N_j$. In particular,

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_e \\ m_\mu \\ m_\tau \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_1 v_1 \\ y_2 v_2 \\ y_2 v_3 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

where v_1 is the vacuum expectation value of the $\underline{1}$ representation, $v_{2,3}$ are those of the $\underline{2}$, and $y_{1,2}$ are their respective Yukawa couplings. In the νN sector, the vacuum expectation values of the corresponding Higgs $\underline{2}$ representation are assumed to be zero, thus $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 (= m_D)$ for all the Dirac neutrino masses. Using the seesaw mechanism, the observed Majorana neutrino mass matrix in the $\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$ basis is then given by

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = -\mathcal{M}_D \mathcal{M}_N^{-1} \mathcal{M}_D^T = \begin{pmatrix} a+2b & c & c \\ c & a-b & d \\ c & d & a-b \end{pmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

where

$$a = [-A^2 + B^2 + (2C^2 + D^2)/3] m_D^2 / det\mathcal{M}_N, \tag{14}$$

$$b = [B(A-B) - (C^2 - D^2)/3] m_D^2 / det\mathcal{M}_N, \tag{15}$$

$$c = C(A - B - D) m_D^2 / det\mathcal{M}_N, \tag{16}$$

$$d = [D(A+2B) - C^2] m_D^2 / det\mathcal{M}_N, \tag{17}$$

$$det\mathcal{M}_N = (A - B - D)[(A+2B)(A-B+D) - 2C^2]. \tag{18}$$

This form of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is precisely that advocated in Ref. [14] on purely phenomenological grounds. As expected, the S_3 limit is obtained if $B = 0$ and $C = D$, for which $b = 0$ and $c = d$, resulting in $(\nu_e + \nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{3}$ as a mass eigenstate. Note that S_4 as well as the residual Z_2 symmetry are assumed broken softly at the scale of supersymmetry breaking. This allows the electroweak vacuum expectation values to be chosen as they are.

In the basis $[\nu_e, (\nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{2}, (-\nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{2}]$, the neutrino mass matrix of Eq. (13) becomes

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a+2b & \sqrt{2}c & 0 \\ \sqrt{2}c & a-b+d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a-b-d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

which exhibits maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing and zero U_{e3} as advertised. The mixing angle of the 2×2 submatrix (for all parameters real) can be simply read off as

$$\tan 2\theta_{12} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}c}{d-3b} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}c}{c-3b-(c-d)}, \tag{20}$$

which reduces to $2\sqrt{2}$ in the S_3 limit of $b = 0$ and $c = d$. This would imply $\tan^2\theta_{12} = 1/2$, resulting in a mixing pattern proposed some time ago [15]. However in this limit, Δm^2_{atm} vanishes as well [16]. Therefore, $\tan^2\theta_{12}$ should not be equal to $1/2$, but since it is natural for b and $c-d$ to be small compared to c, its deviation from $1/2$ is expected to be small. For example,

$$(3b+c-d)/c = -0.15 \implies \tan^2\theta_{12} = 0.45, \tag{21}$$

in excellent agreement with data [8].

The limit $\Delta m^2_{sol} = 0$ implies $2a + b + d = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m^2_{atm} &\equiv m_3^2 - (m_2^2 + m_1^2)/2 = (a-b-d)^2 - (d-3b)^2/4 - 2c^2 \\ &= 6bd - 2(c^2 - d^2) \simeq [6b - 4(c-d)]c, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

which can be either positive or negative, corresponding to a normal or inverted ordering of neutrino masses respectively. If $c - d = 0$, then $\tan^2\theta_{12} < 1/2$ implies an inverted ordering

as in the models of Ref. [16]. It is also possible to set $B = 0$ alone by choosing $f = 0$ in Eq. (5), so that Eq. (20) becomes

$$\tan 2\theta_{12} = \frac{2\sqrt{2}C}{D}, \tag{23}$$

and $\Delta m^2_{sol} = 0$ implies

$$\Delta m^2_{atm} \simeq 9(C-D)C^3(m^2_D/det\mathcal{M}_N)^2. \tag{24}$$

Thus $\tan^2\theta_{12} < 1/2$ would also imply an inverted ordering of neutrino masses in this case.

The effective neutrino mass m_{ee} measured in neutrinoless double beta decay is simply given by the magnitude of the $\nu_e\nu_e$ entry of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$, i.e. $|a+2b|$. Using Eqs. (21), (22), and $|\Delta m^2_{atm}| = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ eV^2, it is in the range 0.10 eV for $c-d=0$ (inverted ordering) and 0.05 eV (normal ordering) for $b=0$.

Returning to the condition $2a+b+d=0$ for $\Delta m^2_{sol}=0$, under which $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ of Eq. (13) becomes

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a+2b & c & c \\ c & a-b & -2a-b \\ c & -2a-b & a-b \end{pmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

it should be noted that this form is invariant under the transformation [17]

$$U\mathcal{M}_\nu U^T = \mathcal{M}_\nu, \tag{26}$$

where

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} i2\sqrt{2}/3 & i/3\sqrt{2} & i/3\sqrt{2} \\ i/3\sqrt{2} & 1/2 - i\sqrt{2}/3 & -1/2 - i\sqrt{2}/3 \\ i/3\sqrt{2} & -1/2 - i\sqrt{2}/3 & 1/2 - i\sqrt{2}/3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U^2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{27}$$

if $c = -2a-4b$, for which $\tan^2\theta_{12} = 1/2$. This limit of $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ corresponds thus to a Z_4 symmetry.

In conclusion, the family symmetry S_4 has been advocated as the origin of the observed pattern of neutrino mixing in the context of a complete supersymmetric theory. The key

is the requirement that supersymmetry is unbroken at the seesaw scale where S_4 is broken. This fixes the pattern of S_4 breaking to retain a residual Z_2 (as well as an approximate S_3) symmetry in the Majorana mass matrix of the heavy singlet neutrinos. At the much lower scale of supersymmetry breaking, S_4 as well as Z_2 are allowed to be broken by soft terms. However, the S_4-invariant Yukawa terms ensure that the charged-lepton mass matrix is diagonal, and the neutrino Dirac masses are equal. This results in a Majorana neutrino mass matrix which exhibits maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing and zero U_{e3}. In the S_3 limit, $(\nu_e + \nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)/\sqrt{3}$ is a mass eigenstate, thus predicting $\tan^2\theta_{12} = 1/2$, but $\Delta m^2_{atm} = 0$ as well. Allowing a small deviation from this limit can result in $\tan^2\theta_{12} = 0.45$ and a nonzero Δm^2_{atm}, in excellent agreement with data.

I thank Michele Frigerio for an important comment. This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

Appendix The matrices of the $\underline{3}$ representation of S_4 are given by

$$C_1 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

$$C_2 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{29}$$

$$C_3 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{30}$$

$$C_4 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

$$C_5 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{32}$$

The matrices of the $\underline{3}'$ representation are the same as those of $\underline{3}$ for $C_{1,2,3}$ and oppposite in sign for $C_{4,5}$. Those of the $\underline{2}$ representation are the same as in S_3, i.e.

$$C_{1,2} \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{33}$$

$$C_3 \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \tag{34}$$

$$C_{4,5} \;:\; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega \\ \omega^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega^2 \\ \omega & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{35}$$

each appearing four times.

References

[1] Y. Ashie *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 112005 (2005) and references therein.

[2] See for example S.-L. Chen, M. Frigerio, and E. Ma, Phys. Lett. **B612**, 29 (2005) and references therein.

[3] See for example J. Kubo, A. Mondragon, M. Mondargon, and E. Rodriguez-Jauregui, Prog. Theor. Phys. **109**, 795 (2003); S.-L. Chen, M. Frigerio, and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 073008 (2004) and references therein.

[4] See for example W. Grimus, A. S. Joshipura, S. Kaneko, L. Lavoura, and M. Tanimoto, JHEP **0407**, 078 (2004).

[5] See for example E. Ma, hep-ph/0508099 and references therein.

[6] M. Frigerio, S. Kaneko, E. Ma, and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 011901(R) (2005). The quaternion group is denoted here as Q_8, but is called Q_4 in the convention of Ref. [7].

[7] K. S. Babu and J. Kubo, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 056006 (2005); J. Kubo, hep-ph/0506043.

[8] B. Aharmim *et al.*, nucl-ex/0502021.

[9] See for example G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Nucl.Phys. **B720**, 64 (2005); K. S. Babu and X.-G. He, hep-ph/0507217.

[10] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, edited by P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), p. 315; T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe*, edited by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK Report No. 79-18, Tsukuba,

Japan, 1979), p. 95; R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[11] Y. Yamanaka, H. Sugawara, and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Rev. **D25**, 1895 (1982); Erratum: ibid. **D29**, 2135 (1984).

[12] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A17**, 2361 (2002).

[13] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 113012 (2001).

[14] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 117301 (2002).

[15] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins, and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B530**, 167 (2002).

[16] S.-L. Chen, M. Frigerio, and E. Ma, hep-ph/0504181, M. Hirsch, A. Villanova del Moral, J. W. F. Valle, and E. Ma, hep-ph/0507148.

[17] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 221802 (2003); E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 031702(R) (2003).